

1 RANDOLPH & LEVANAS
Attorneys at Law
2 11620 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 610
3 Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: 213/473-0822
4

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
6
7

FILED
AUG 20 1981
CLERK, U. S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 STEVE MILLER,
12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 KEVIN M. FLYNN,
15 FLYNN ASSOCIATES MANAGEMENT
CORPORATION,
16 MICHAEL FLYNN,
JOSEPH FLANNIGAN,
17 LEV FEDYNIAC,
PAT OSLER,
18 JOHN G. CLARK, JR., M.D.
BOSTON PERSONNEL DEVELOP-
19 MENT INSTITUTE,
EDWARD WALTERS,
20 JACK CHANCELLOR,
PAULETTE COOPER, and
21 BRUCE HOENIG
Defendants.

Civil Case No. 81 4275 - FW
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR:

- (1) Conspiracy to deprive
civil rights;
(2) False imprisonment;
(3) Assault;
(4) Battery;
(5) Intentional infliction
of emotional distress;
(6) Invasion of privacy.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

22
23 Plaintiff alleges as follows:

24 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
25 JURISDICTION

26 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant
27 to 28 U.S.C. Sections 1332, 1343(1), 1343(4), and 42 U.S.C.
28 Section 1985(c), as hereinafter more fully appears.

COUNT I

(Conspiracy in Violation of 42 U.S.C. Section 1985(c))

A. The Conspiracy

17. Beginning at a time unknown to Plaintiff, and continuing through the present, the Defendants and conspirators formed a conspiracy with respect to which each and every Defendant was or became a co-conspirator. The purpose of the conspiracy was to deprive Plaintiff of the equal protection of the law and of the privileges and immunities granted to him under the laws in the Constitution of the United States. The conspiracy was the result of Defendants' class based animus towards the Church and its members, and because Plaintiff was a member of that class of persons who belonged to the Church. Defendants' purpose was willfully, wrongfully, and maliciously (a) to coerce the Plaintiff through the use of force, threats of force, verbal abuse and deprivation of liberty into renouncing his religious affiliation with the Church, (b) to prevent Plaintiff from freely associating with other members of the Church, (c) to prevent and intimidate Plaintiff from travelling among and between the several states, (d) to prevent Plaintiff from freely discussing and exchanging his religious beliefs and ideas, and (e) to prevent Plaintiff from freely exercising religious beliefs.

B. Acts in Furtherance of the Conspiracy

18. On a date unknown to Plaintiff, Bernard and Harriet Miller, Plaintiff's parents (hereinafter "Parents"), hired Defendants Kevin Flynn and Flynn Associates, by and through its agent, Kevin Flynn, for the specific purpose of coercing Plaintiff to renounce his affiliation to the Church. Having agreed to be

retained for said purpose, and being so retained, Defendants Kevin Flynn and Flynn Associates, by and through its agent, Kevin Flynn, thereafter did devise a scheme by which Plaintiff would be transported under the ruse of a vacation, imprisoned for a period of time, and be forced to undergo mental and emotional distress. Said Defendants personally hired agents to assist in carrying out the scheme, including Defendants Flannigan, Fedyniac, and Osler.

19. During the month of January, 1981, while engaged in a telephone conversation between Plaintiff and his parents, Plaintiff was informed that he was invited to join his parents for a vacation on the island of Aruba.

20. On or about January 23, 1981, Plaintiff travelled from his residence in California to join his parents for the purpose of said vacation.

21. On or about January 25, 1981, Plaintiff and his parents flew to Bermuda, ostensibly for a brief stopover due to complications in their earlier travel plans. Defendants Flannigan, Osler and Fedyniac were waiting for Plaintiff at the hotel in Bermuda to which Plaintiff was taken by his parents. It was the intent of the named Defendants to imprison Plaintiff in said hotel on the island of Bermuda for the insidious purpose of coercing him into renouncing his religious affiliation with the Church.

22. After Plaintiff had arrived at the hotel in Bermuda, his parents and Defendants decided that the location was not suitable for the objectives of their conspiracy, and an alternative plan was formulated to imprison Plaintiff in the apartment of a friend located in the United States.

1 23. After approximately 20 hours in Bermuda, Bernard Miller
2 informed Plaintiff that their travel arrangements had been poorly
3 planned and that, due to complications, they should return to
4 New York. On or about January 26, 1981, Plaintiff and his par-
5 ents returned to New York.

6 24. On or about January 27, 1981, Plaintiff's parents
7 invited Plaintiff to see a Broadway play, and en route stopped at
8 the apartment of Francis Hagt, a family friend, ostensibly for a
9 short visit. Said apartment is located on approximately the 15th
10 floor of a high rise apartment building in the State of New York.

11 25. Upon arrival at the apartment, Plaintiff was escorted
12 into the bedroom by his parents and Francis Hagt. As Plaintiff
13 entered the bedroom, Defendant Flannigan stepped out from the
14 area of the bedroom closet and stated his name. Plaintiff turned
15 to discover that Defendants Osler and Fedyniac were also now
16 present in the bedroom. Francis Hagt and Harriet Miller left
17 the bedroom.

18 26. At this time, Bernard Miller explained that he had
19 invited the above-named Defendants to talk with Plaintiff for a
20 few days about his relationship with the Church.

21 27. At this moment, Plaintiff turned to leave the room with
22 the intent of leaving the building and returning to his residence
23 in California. At the bedroom door, Plaintiff was physically
24 restrained by Defendant Osler, and not permitted to leave the
25 room.

26 28. Defendant Flannigan informed Plaintiff that he would
27 remain at this location for a period of approximately three days
28 for the purpose of reading and discussing materials that

1 Defendants had brought to the location.

2 29. Plaintiff remained at said location pursuant to Defen-
3 dants' instructions until approximately 2:00 p.m. on January 30,
4 1981. Despite numerous requests during the course of his impri-
5 sonment, Plaintiff was not allowed to leave the bedroom and the
6 adjoining bathroom. During the course of the three days, Plain-
7 tiff was forced to engage in conversation, was subjected to
8 readings from materials selected by Defendants, and was forced to
9 personally read other materials, as dictated by Defendants Flan-
10 nigan, Osler, and Fedyniac.

11 30. During said three days, Plaintiff was constantly in
12 sight of one or more Defendants, the door to the adjoining bath-
13 room having been removed from its hinges prior to Plaintiff's
14 entrance into said bedroom, thus allowing to persons in the
15 bedroom area a clear and ^{un}obstructed view of all portions of the
16 bathroom. Additionally, one of the two beds in the room was
17 jammed against the bedroom door each night, and one Defendant
18 would sleep on that bed. Plaintiff was also informed that an
19 additional Defendant was located on the opposite side of the
20 bedroom door at all times during the night. At no time was
21 Plaintiff allowed to remain alone in the room.

22 31. At approximately 2:00 p.m. on Friday, January 30, 1981,
23 Plaintiff was permitted by Defendants to leave the location.

24 32. During Plaintiff's three day period of imprisonment,
25 all Defendants engaged in a continuous attempt to coerce Plain-
26 tiff into renouncing his religious affiliation with the Church by
27 impressing upon him their interpretation of various documents,
28 books, and other materials. Said coercion was often accompanied

1 by argumentative and threatening gestures and statements. During
2 this time, in order to avoid prolonged imprisonment and violence
3 to his person, Plaintiff feigned interest in the teachings and
4 conversations, knowing that escape was impossible.

5 33. On January 30, 1981, prior to his release, Defendant
6 Flannigan requested that Plaintiff go to the home of Defendant
7 Cooper for the purpose of continuing their discussion regarding
8 Plaintiff's affiliation with the Church. Plaintiff agreed, in
9 the hope that continued cooperation would terminate the
10 imprisonment, remove the threat of violence, and hopefully
11 prevent further violations of his civil rights from occurring.

12 34. At approximately 6:30 p.m. on January 30, 1981, Plain-
13 tiff went to the home of Defendant Cooper, and remained there for
14 several hours. Present were Defendants Cooper, Flannigan, Osler,
15 Fedyniac, and others. Portions of the conversation between the
16 above-mentioned persons and Plaintiff challenged his continued
17 relationship with the Church.

18 35. On or about February 3rd, 1981, at the request of his
19 parents, Plaintiff flew to Las Vegas, Nevada, to engage in a
20 conversation with Defendant Walters. Defendant agreed to said
21 action in the hope that cooperation with his parents' wishes
22 would prevent future violations by Defendants in Plaintiff's
23 civil rights. Plaintiff was engaged in conversation with Defen-
24 dant Walters for approximately three hours. Also present and
25 involved in said conversation was Defendant Chancellor. During
26 the course of this conversation, both Defendants Walters and
27 Chancellor attempted to cause Plaintiff to renounce his affilia-
28 tion with the Church. On February 3rd, 1981, Plaintiff returned